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Appendix 1
SNAP-Ed Administrative Expenditure Charts

Curriculum Fidelity
Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense:</th>
<th>Curriculum Fidelity Washington State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR services, etc.)</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting costs for quarterly/annual reporting are salary only; included in the administrative salary.

**$6700 was to purchase Eating Smart ● Being Active Curriculum that was distributed to local partners at training.
## Farm to Community

Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense:</th>
<th>Washington State University- Farm To Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR services, etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide Branding and Communication
Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense:</th>
<th>Washington State University Branding and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR services, etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SNAP-Ed Statewide Evaluation

Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expense:</th>
<th>Washington State Department of Health, Statewide Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Space</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Equipment</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-agency costs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Local Government Activity</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Region 1 Implementing Agency (IA) – Spokane Regional Health District

Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures for each Implementing Agency by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense</th>
<th>Name of IA: Spokane Regional Health District</th>
<th>Name of IA: Spokane Regional Health District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
<td>$ values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR services, etc.)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures for each Implementing Agency by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense</th>
<th>Name of IA: WA DOH - Region 2</th>
<th>Name of IA: WA DOH - Region 4</th>
<th>Name of IA: WA DOH - Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% values</td>
<td>$ values</td>
<td>% values</td>
<td>$ values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>56.03% $123,174</td>
<td>46.70% $389,464</td>
<td>51.52% $277,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training</td>
<td>0.09% $200</td>
<td>0.05% $400</td>
<td>0.07% $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>1.36% $3,000</td>
<td>0.42% $3,500</td>
<td>0.56% $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>1.53% $3,356.16</td>
<td>2.19% $18,265.59</td>
<td>1.77% $9,552.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>0.71% $1,562</td>
<td>0.57% $4,773</td>
<td>0.58% $3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>37.59% $82,625</td>
<td>48.07% $400,866</td>
<td>42.91% $231,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR, etc.)</td>
<td>2.69% $5,909</td>
<td>2.00% $16,664</td>
<td>2.59% $13,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Region 3 Implementing Agency (IA) – Washington State University

Percent of Total Administrative Expenditures for each Implementing Agency by Type of Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense:</th>
<th>Washington State University Region 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Curriculum Fidelity Statewide Initiative

Direct education is used in the Washington State SNAP-Ed program to help achieve our overarching goal: to assist low income families in their understanding of healthy food choices, the importance of physical activity to their health and ultimately a reduction in obesity for the people we serve. When curriculum is delivered with fidelity we know there is a greater degree of behavior change seen. Conversely, poor implementation or lack of implementation fidelity can, and often does, change or decrease the impact of the intervention. Direct education in the Washington SNAP-Ed program focuses on research and evidence-based curricula that meet the needs of local communities and target populations. These include age appropriate curricula, materials that help address language barriers, and practical application for selection and preparation of healthy food. Table 1 lists the 10 most frequently used curricula in the state during FFY2017. A complete list of approved curricula can be referenced in the most recent SNAP-Ed State plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eating Smart • Being Active</th>
<th>Growing Healthy Habits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose Health, Food, Fun and Fitness</td>
<td>Cooking Matters in the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Shop, Save &amp; Cook</td>
<td>Cooking Matters in the Pantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids in the Kitchen</td>
<td>Eat Smart, Live Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick a Better Snack and Act</td>
<td>Grazin’ with Marty Moose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY17 was the first year Washington SNAP-Ed had a statewide program dedicated to curriculum fidelity. The curriculum project lead assembled a staff with experience in nutrition and physical activity content, project management and monitoring, plus direct education experience in SNAP-Ed programs. The Curriculum Team worked to develop tools and processes to assess fidelity and to provide support to all local providers in the implementation of direct education programs.

A search of the literature, as well as a review of work done in other states, was conducted to guide the development of the program. Assessment tools were developed for use during visits to observe local providers in the delivery of direct education across the state. A website was developed for information dissemination, and tools were developed to support curriculum fidelity monitoring. These include guidance about allowable modifications for approved curriculum and a site visit process to ensure all local providers had a clear understanding of what to expect during a site visit. ([http://extension.wsu.edu/curriculum-fidelity/](http://extension.wsu.edu/curriculum-fidelity/)).
Newly developed tools (called Curriculum Overviews and Lesson Assessment Tools, Figure 1) were implemented to assess curriculum fidelity and to support educators with implementation of approved curriculum. Overviews, developed for each curriculum on the approved curriculum list, describe the key components of the curriculum as well as specific core requirements for fidelity (http://extension.wsu.edu/curriculum-fidelity/curriculum-overviews/).

A lesson assessment tool, (Figure 2) was developed for each lesson being taught. They were used as teaching tools for educators, as well as a data collection form for observers, to assess curriculum fidelity. (http://extension.wsu.edu/curriculum-fidelity/snap-ed-educator-self-assessment-forms/)

In addition, electronic data collection forms were developed in Qualtrics Survey Software. Data from regional site visits will be entered in Qualtrics and looked at in terms of adherence to curriculum fidelity. These will be piloted in FFY2018.

We will also compare fidelity data to impact data collected by our state Evaluation Team. Comparing these two data sets will allow us to see strengths and weaknesses of direct education and provide guidance for continuous improvement.

The Curriculum Team conducted state-wide monitoring, including on-site observations, to assess the level of consistent curriculum implementation with fidelity. A total of 99 site visits, across all five regions, were done during FFY2017. This is fewer than our goal of 120 due to limited staffing at the start of the project. Technical support in terms of classroom management, allowable curriculum modifications and teaching strategies were shared with educators whenever possible. Written reports were sent to local provider managers and their respective Implementing Agencies. Additional visits were made to local providers to assist in a better understanding of curriculum fidelity as well as for technical support. The time spent time in all regions provided a baseline to better understand challenges local providers are faced with as well as a better understanding of the positive impact SNAP-Ed direct education has on communities across the state.
We saw creative, enthusiastic educators working with SNAP-Ed participants from all age groups. Specific examples include: elementary students tasting healthy foods they had never tried before; dark green, leafy vegetables being grown in the middle of the winter using hydroponic growing techniques and seniors being encouraged to increase the amount of physical activity they get each day.

In general, we saw most programs delivering curriculum with fidelity. Assessment tools allow us to document areas in a lesson that are not taught with fidelity and provide us with a method to document observations. The assessment tools also provide a way to record the many positive ways SNAP-Ed direct education is delivered in the state of Washington. Educators across the state are engaged with their participants and dedicated to the common goal of helping children and families make healthy food choices.

There were many strengths identified as we conducted site visits across the state. For example, educators have a strong knowledge base of nutrition and food resource management. They’re adept at responding to participant questions and provide information centered on the USDA Dietary Guidelines. Areas for improvement are based on obstacles identified such as adequate time to complete lessons, lack of training on curriculum and adequate funds to deliver all aspects of curriculum as written (copying costs for newsletters, purchase of supplies, etc).

Because we were able to visit many direct education classes across the state, we were able to talk with educators and managers about what they see as needs for the program. Requests for training were made by numerous educators and we worked with the state agency and regional Implementing Agencies to identify priorities as they pertain to curriculum fidelity.

Educators want to be trained on curriculum as part of the process of achieving curriculum fidelity. As a result of what we learned during site visits, the Curriculum Team conducted three trainings (Wenatchee, Olympia and Mount Vernon) on the 2017 Revised Eating Smart • Being Active in Summer 2017. These trainings were for educators who had previously taught the 2010 version of the curriculum. Thirty people were trained from 13 local providers. Three webinars about adult learning were developed and recorded by Susan Baker, EdD, Colorado State University to support training of new educators and provide a review for current educators. Divided into a three part series, the webinars walk educators through the principles of adult learning, best practice in delivery of curriculum to adult participants as well as questions taken from educators on how to handle difficult situations in an adult classroom setting. The webinars will be incorporated into the FFY2018 training for Eating Smart • Being Active for
educators who have not previously taught the curriculum. They can be found at: http://extension.wsu.edu/curriculum-fidelity/training-2/

Moving forward to FFY2018, we will provide training on a variety of topics that address program challenges, requests from local providers and to ensure that our direct education program delivers curriculum with fidelity. Our training plan includes: classroom tools and strategies, adult learning and engagement; food safety, understanding curriculum fidelity as well as targeted trainings for several curricula new to the state: Eating Smart • Being Active (for new users); CATCH and EatFit.

We know that when lessons are taught as written, there is greater behavior change. Strengthening fidelity is a multi-year process. Taking the right steps and doing the steps right will lead to better quality outcomes for Washington State.
Appendix 3

DOH Older Youth Project

Background
Older youth are a FNS identified SNAP-Ed priority population. Historically however, Washington SNAP-Ed has encountered challenges when working with older youth including: lack of training on how to best engage and retain older youth in programming, limited curriculum and programming options, and challenges with reaching older youth in schools. The Washington State Department of Health (DOH) recognized that achieving a statewide standard of older youth programming that both meaningfully engages and empowers older youth required a dedicated space to adequately investigate the key issues that surround this population. The Year 1 goal of the Older Youth Project was to establish a framework to identify best practices for working with older youth in Washington.

Activities

QUARTER 1 (OCTOBER-DECEMBER 31)
Department of Health SNAP-Ed staff developed a work plan for the Older Youth Project, including developing a workgroup of SNAP-Ed educators and contracting with DOH training specialists to help accomplish the activities of the project. Solicitations for workgroup members happened through the SNAP-Ed Statewide Forum and subsequent emails. Workgroup members were chosen on the following criteria:

- Current SNAP-Ed employee
- Passion for working with older youth
- FFY17 programming scheduled with older youth, with geographic and programmatic diversity
- Capacity for a 0.1 full-time employment (FTE) (meaning the SNAP-Ed applicant couldn’t already be 1.0 FTE)
- Ability to work in a self-directed environment

Ultimately 7 local agency employees were selected with all 5 SNAP-Ed regions represented. Each workgroup member received a budget of $13,340 and a separate Department of Health contract with Older Youth Project Statement of Work expectations.

QUARTER 2 (JANUARY-MARCH 31)
Research questions were developed that help guide the direction of the learning for the year. They included:

- What promotes or inhibits the recruitment, engagement, and retention of older youth in SNAP-Ed programming?
- What factors lead to adoption of healthy eating and active living health behaviors among older youth?
What policy and environmental changes lead to adoption of healthy eating and active living behaviors among older youth?

What tools and support would encourage, retain, and be of use for educators planning or currently working with older youth?

To learn more about these questions, members of the Older Youth Project workgroup were tasked to:

- Conduct focus groups with older youth
- Conduct key informant interviews with SNAP-Ed educators, school staff and administration, and other stakeholders working with older youth
- Attend relevant trainings and conferences
- Learn from research and relevant articles.

Department of Health staff planned and facilitated a workgroup orientation call going over the expectations and activities of the workgroup. Additionally, DOH staff hosted a training on best practices for conducting focus groups with youth.

**Quarter 3 (April-June 30)**

Workgroup members continued to complete focus groups with older youth, key informant interviews with stakeholders, research, and webinars/trainings. Two workgroup members were approved by FNS to attend the Childhood Obesity Conference in California. Another member visited Los Angeles to learn from Public Health Institute’s YPAR program. Learning from all the activities, workgroup members documented different types of programming and key components that lead to a successful older youth program.

The workgroup connected with biweekly check-in calls and smaller workgroup working meetings. Workgroup members discussed difficulties and barriers with current curriculum and programming, and shared programming ideas and key concepts from their experiences or recent activities. Through these conversations, the workgroup determined that the deliverable the group is working towards is a summary of lessons learned, written to help an educator/coordinator who is working with older youth.

Workgroup members also met with evaluation and curriculum SNAP-Ed leads (Nora Downs and Maggie Grate) to provide input about curriculum and evaluation as related to older youth.

**Quarter 4 (July-September 31)**

As the fiscal year end approached, the workgroup focused more on how to best gather and document our work to share with others. At the two-day capstone meeting in late August, each workgroup member presented findings from their year to the group. Additionally, a guest speaker from GRUB, an extremely successful older youth program in Thurston County, inspired us with where SNAP-Ed can go.
Collectively, workgroup members captured data from more than 24 focus groups (reaching more than 200 youth), dozens of key informant interviews, and several dozen in-person and online trainings.

**Challenges**
Below are a summary of lessons learned about forming a successful workgroup.

- **Initial prep work:** Having more structure to the workgroup from the beginning would have helped lessen confusion on the goals of the workgroup. In retrospect, having a smaller two to three person leadership team that met initially to develop the research questions, focus group questions, final deliverable, budget needs, timeline proposal, and pre-approved training opportunities would have been ideal.

- **In-person meetings:** Workgroup members expressed that they enjoyed meeting in person at the end of the project and wished that they had an opportunity to meet at the beginning as well. This would have given them the opportunity to know who was on the phone, why each person was there, and what they were focused on in their work.

- **Communication:** Finding better ways to communicate and share resources was a challenge. Phone call times were not always convenient for all workgroup members. Similarly, most workgroup members expressed frustration with the SharePoint site.

- **Making the most of this opportunity:** This workgroup was an incredible opportunity to dive into one topic and learn as much as possible. Each of the workgroup members expressed wanting to do more than the time available.

**Next Steps**
Our next steps will be compiling the resources we gathered, the advice we gained from older youth, teachers, and other stakeholders, and the structures we think work well for older youth. We will compose this information in a meaningful and appealing way that speaks to SNAP-Ed educators and include recommendations for working with older youth in Washington.
OUT OF OBSCURITY, INTO THE LIGHT
A brand serves to promote and reflect the mission and values of an organization. With the restructuring of the SNAP-Ed program in Washington, there was interest in assessing the perception of the SNAP-Ed brand with providers and non-providers serving SNAP-eligible clients. WSU SNAP-Ed, in collaboration with the WSU Carson College of Business Marketing Department, completed Phase I of the two-year project. Focus groups were conducted in all five SNAP-Ed regions. Data was analyzed by WSU Division of Governmental Studies and Services. For the full report, see Appendix A.

RESULTS
Participant Description

Key Findings
• It is perceived that “SNAP-Ed” is not easily recognized by clients. It doesn’t convey the values and mission of SNAP-Ed.
• Non-providers, as key links to clients, are more likely to emphasize negative aspects of SNAP-Ed.
• Analysis suggests a need for stronger marketing and promotion of events, brand and activities.
• Key SNAP-Ed themes and word associations identified in Phase I will provide a strong basis for Phase II of this project.
• The top reasons for clients to attend programming as perceived by non-providers are “incentives” and “health,” but are perceived by providers as “relationships” and “results/incentives.”

RECOMMENDATIONS
• Future brand development should make the program’s values and mission clearer to clients and non-providers.
• Rebranding efforts should focus on clients and non-providers to ensure that a rebrand resonates with external stakeholders.
• Use Phase I themes and word associations as a basis for Phase II of this project.
• To be successful SNAP-Ed, or its rebrand, needs a stronger marketing and promotion plan targeting clients and non-providers. This could involve tangible items to advertise the rebrand like pencils and promotional items.
• SNAP-Ed needs to improve its online presence, or at least make digital resources better known to non-provider agencies and clients.
Spokane County

Local Lead Agency: Catholic Charities Spokane
Jesse Hansen, Food for All Coordinator and Kendra Dean, Project Manager

Accomplishments:

⇒ Key informant interviews with members of different sectors within the food system to assess opportunities and areas of readiness within Early Childhood Education, schools and emergency food providers.
⇒ Strengthened collaboration between WSU Stevens County and Catholic Charities for I-395 Corridor Project.
⇒ Exploration of purchasing power for locally grown produce within Catholic Charities own meal programs.
⇒ Support in formalizing “Giving Gardens” within the all-volunteer Spokane Community Gardens network by providing tools and resources.
⇒ Exploration of expanding scratch cooking program adopted by two school districts with support from the Empire Health foundation as an opportunity to include more locally produced food in school meals.
⇒ Strengthening of local partnership with LiINC foods to expand aggregation infrastructure to serve local needs.

Opportunities:

⇒ Explore incorporating farm direct purchases into the school district’s Summer Feeding Program.
⇒ Pursue partnership development with Early Childhood Education providers to aggregate purchases.
⇒ Provide ongoing support of Giving Gardens and expand tracking and delivery of food to local meal providers and food banks.
⇒ Pursue initiation of SNAP benefit acceptance and incentive programs at Farmers Markets as well as continuing expansion of Kernel program to engage kids and families in the markets.

Key Barriers:

- There is significant geographic distance between neighboring counties and among population centers. While there is a vision for how to efficiently move produce, including locally grown fruits and vegetables, along the Interstate 395 Corridor, it is not yet financially viable for a for-profit or non-profit entity.
- Spokane Public Schools, the largest district in the county, is re-tooling their farm direct procurement for the 17-18 school year causing the farmer cooperative to adjust plantings.
- Tracking of community garden production and donations has not been formalized and further development of the system to increase efficiency and volume is needed.
- Small producers in neighboring counties struggle to meet the demands of larger institutions, taking them out of the market. Further work on aggregation is needed.

Staffing:

- WSU SNAP-Ed:
  Jen Hey, RD
  Program Manager
  Julie Evenson
  Program Coordinator

- WSDA Food Assistance and Regional Markets:
  Laura Raymond
  Regional Markets Team Lead
  Tracy Wilking
  Farm to Community and School
Island County
Local Lead Agency: WSU Island County
Dr. Timothy Lawrence, Director & Anza Muenchow, Farm to School (SNAP-Ed) Coordinator

Accomplishments:

⇒ Key informant interviews with members of different sectors within the food system to assess opportunities and areas of readiness.
⇒ Planning, design and establishment of two new school gardens within the Oak Harbor School District.
⇒ Planning for a new school foodservice Harvest of the Month menu program in Oak Harbor School District’s elementary schools for 17-18.
⇒ Planning, design and establishment of 11 raised beds at the U.S. Whidbey Air Naval Base for use by unaccompanied sailors including a bed dedicated to growing food for a local meal program.
⇒ Discussion with U.S. Whidbey Air Naval Base Commissary Manager regarding procurement and promotion of Washington grown fruits and vegetables within existing vendor contract.

Opportunities:

⇒ Expand Farm to School programming within the Oak Harbor School District among all grade levels, with a special emphasis on the elementary schools with new gardens.
⇒ Explore incorporating farm direct purchases into the school district’s Summer Feeding Program.
⇒ Continue partnership and collaborative programming with staff at the Whidbey Air Naval Base.
⇒ Create opportunities for diverse stakeholders to discuss ways to help SNAP-eligible adults and families access locally-grown produce.
⇒ Continue dialog with county farmers market Boards about the benefits of accepting SNAP at their market.
⇒ Explore ways to secure transportation for Seniors to

Key Barriers:

• Part of the county’s economy is based on its being a tourist destination, therefore much of the agricultural activity focuses on wholesale selling to restaurants located on and also in neighboring counties.
• Large economic disparity exists in the county, between the two islands –Whidbey and Camano–as well as within Whidbey Island, primarily along a north/south border. This makes ensuring that activities are solely focused on a SNAP-eligible audience difficult at times.
• The qualifying SNAP-Ed school district contracts with a foodservice management company which has yet to embrace a comprehensive Farm to School program; although, in the 2017-2018 school year, the district will launch a Harvest of the Month program in which seasonal fruits and vegetables will be highlighted and served on the menu.
• The senior population currently has limited transportation access to the local farmers markets, making redemption of Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program vouchers difficult.
Clallam County
Local Lead Agency: WSU Clallam County
Clea Rome, Director & Karlena Brailey, Nutrition Educator

Accomplishments:

⇒ Identification of key stakeholders and establishment of tracking protocol.
⇒ Key informant interviews with members of multiple sectors within the food system to assess opportunities and areas of readiness.
⇒ Community gathering in Neah Bay with Makah tribal members and service providers to discuss local food access issues leading to launch of a community farm stand accepting WIC and Senior's Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) Vouchers.
⇒ Presentation to the Board of Directors for the Sequim Farmers Market on the rationale for and benefits of accepting SNAP benefits resulting in the Board planning to pursue a SNAP application and launch later in the 2017 season.
⇒ Launch of WSU Clallam County Soil Class for the Makah Tribe
⇒ Ongoing participation in Growing Connections workshop series hosted by Northwest Harvest, including local emergency food providers and local growers.
⇒ Collaboration with Olympic Peninsula Healthy Communities Coalition.

⇒ Aggregation of local apples and convening of volunteers to make applesauce to be distributed at emergency food sites.
⇒ Establishment of community garden if Forks.

Future Opportunities:

⇒ Continue to assist with establishment and launch of a farmers market with the Makah Tribe.
⇒ Create more local food preservers and champions to work with community social service agencies.
⇒ Expand local food access conversations and solutions to the City of Forks and Lower Elwha.
⇒ Pursue a county-wide infrastructure improvement for multi-use cold storage and processing of locally grown fruits and vegetables.

Key Barriers:

- The distance between many of these communities is a key barrier to transporting produce and other foods grown in one part of the county to the outlying areas, including Neah Bay and Forks.
- There are few facilities for processing fruits and vegetables, fish, game, and other foraged foods which in turn limits the communities and supporting organizations’ abilities to preserve foods to extend their shelf life.
- Regulations and policies set by the federal government, State of Washington and the Makah Tribal Council combined can result in limiting the amount of fish caught, game hunted, and foods sold locally.
- Very small farms and farmers markets don’t always qualify for programs designed to help launch or support accepting and matching SNAP benefits for recipients.
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Statewide Farmers Market Project

The Washington State Department of Health’s (DOH) Statewide Farmers Market Project works to increase farmers market access and participation among SNAP clients and SNAP-eligible populations. The project also works with local communities to develop strategies to increase access and appeal of healthy foods, reduce food insecurity, and improve local food systems. In FFY17 the project achieved its objectives to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) increase the number of farmers markets accepting food assistance benefits;</td>
<td>8 farmers markets with new SNAP programs; 2 farmers markets with new FMNP programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) increase the % of SNAP benefits redeemed at markets;</td>
<td>13.1% increase in SNAP reimbursements made to vendors* since the project launched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) increase the # of farmers markets with incentive programs; and</td>
<td>14 farmers markets with new SNAP match incentive programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) increase the # of markets with at least one change in writing or practice to improve access or appeal of healthy foods.</td>
<td>15 farmers markets with new food access programs†.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partner markets reporting 2015-2017 transaction data to DOH (n=85).
†Includes youth programming focused on healthy eating and incentives for fruit and vegetables, SNAP Ambassador programs, and matching programs for Senior FMNP.

The Washington State Farmers Market Association (WSFMA) serves as lead contractor for the Statewide Farmers Market Project. WSFMA uses a regional model to provide SNAP-Ed support to farmers markets across the state. Each region has a local food system champion, or Regional Lead, that works with local partners to identify and implement strategies that improve food access for underserved populations. In FFY17 WSFMA’s Regional Lead Program expanded to five additional regions, for a total of 12 regions and support for 103 farmers markets.

FFY17 Regional Highlights

- The West Sound Regional Lead developed and piloted SNAP Ambassador programs at Jefferson County Farmers Markets and the Port Angeles Farmers Markets.
- At the Olympia Farmers Market, the local WIC clinic is now distributing WIC checks on Saturdays at the market as a result of the South Sound Lead persuading clinic administrators to change their policy about staff working on Saturdays.

$989,397

LT14f. Economic impact of SNAP-Ed affiliated changes in local and regional food production, processing, distribution, and sales*

*Based on USDA’s estimate that $1.79 is generated in the local economy for every SNAP dollar spent (SNAP + SNAP incentives).
- The Pierce County Regional Lead secured $10,000 from the City of Tacoma Office of Sustainability to fund Senior Farm Share programs and Market Tour programs.

- The Oregon State University now trains volunteers to give farmers market tours and cooking demos in collaboration with the Columbia Gorge Regional Lead.

- The Columbia Gorge Lead secured funding from the City of Stevenson and City of Goldendale to establish youth nutrition programming and SNAP incentive programs at local markets.

- The Tri-County Regional Lead developed a network for market managers and community partners to communicate with one another through in-person meetings, phone calls, and email.

- Partnership between the Snohomish County Lead and a local non-profit resulted in SNAP incentive training for 6 farmers markets and sponsorship from Snohomish County for 2018 SNAP incentive programming.

- The Spokane Regional Lead developed a toolkit for their Kids Eating Right Nutrition and Exercise for Life (KERNEL) program to provide markets across the state with the resources necessary to implement kids activities. With help from the Spokane Lead, KERNEL programming was implemented in 3 new counties (Benton, Franklin, and Yakima).

**MT5. Nutrition Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT5b. Total number of policy changes</th>
<th>MT5c. Total number of systems changes</th>
<th>MT5d. Total number of environmental changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Leads (regional)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSFMA (statewide)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MT8. Agriculture**

- Number of farmers markets that accept SNAP benefits
- Number of farmers markets that offer SNAP-bonus incentive programs (MT8b)
- Number of farmers markets that accept FMNP

**MT8e. Estimated number of people in the target population who have increased access to or benefit from the agricultural policy or intervention**

1,293,364

*WSFMA Regional Leads Program*
**FFY17 Statewide Highlights**

The Washington State Farmers Market Association also works at the state level to implement PSE changes that impact SNAP usage at farmers markets.

- In FFY17 WSFMA successfully petitioned the Washington State Department of Health and FNS to amend product eligibility for farmers markets participating in Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive (FINI) grant funded SNAP incentive programs to include frozen, dried, and canned fruits and vegetables with no added salt, fat, oil, or sugar. WSFMA also led efforts to coordinate and communicate the statewide roll-out of the expanded eligibility change to farmers markets across the state.

- WSFMA also developed a system to share information about food assistance benefit programs at farmers markets with Basic Food Outreach contractors. WSFMA presented information about food assistance benefit programs at farmers markets at throughout the state by partnering with Within Reach and People for People. They reached approximately 130 local agency staff members.

- WSFMA worked with the Washington Department of Social Health Services to develop a fact sheet about Washington’s free EBT equipment program for farmers markets and direct market farmers. They also developed a system to disseminate the information to partners throughout the state.

In FFY17 the Statewide Farmers Market Project partnered with the DOH FINI grant to collect SNAP customer feedback from Washington farmers markets. Here’s what a few SNAP clients had to say about Washington’s SNAP matching incentive programs:

- “Using double bucks allows me to purchase more healthy fruits and veggies from local farmers. Getting to know the farmers establishes a relationship between my meals and the land from which they came.”

- “I get so many I buy almost one of every veggie at the market. I’m so lucky to try new things. This program changed the way I eat and prepare meals. I can’t wait for next summer.”

- “I make little enough to qualify for food stamps having this program is so important to me. It helps my food benefits go farther and allows me to eat healthier while supporting local farmers.”

| MT8a-1. Number of farmers markets that accept SNAP benefits per 10,000 SNAP recipients |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1.3                            | 2015            |
| 1.7                            | 2016            |
| 2.0                            | 2017            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST7a. The number of active partnerships in SNAP-Ed qualified sites or organizations that regularly meet, exchange information, and implement mutually reinforcing activities that will contribute to adoption of one or more organizational changes or policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Washington SNAP-Ed
Instructions for the PSE Project Evaluation Form

About this form: This form was designed to collect information on Policy, Systems, and Environment projects in Washington SNAP-Ed. It collects all the information you and your implementing agency will need for reporting to the SNAP Ed funder. It also includes reflective questions that you can use to help improve your program. The reflective questions will also allow the evaluation team to identify opportunities for training. The evaluation team will aggregate responses and create a statewide report to showcase the depth and breadth of SNAP-Ed PSE work. Reports, trainings, and resource lists created from responses to the PSE forms will be available for implementing Agencies and Local Agencies to use learn about statewide practices, successes, and challenges.

General Instructions

• Please fill out a separate form for every SNAP-Ed PSE or Social Marketing Project that your organization led in FFY 2017 (October 2016-September 2017). Please fill out to the best of your ability, as concisely as possible.

• There are six (6) sections on the form. Please double check to ensure all six sections are complete.

• There are several drop-down menus in the form. If you have trouble viewing them, the “Drop-Down Key” tab notes the menu selections for each drop-down list.

• Please label your completed form as follows: LocalAgency/Nameorinitials_Project_Date (Example: DOH_PSEForm_09012017)

• Please save completed forms as excel (.xlsx, .xltx) or .csv files.

• Please send any questions, completed form, and attachments to Nora at: Nora.Downs@doh.wa.gov

• This form is due to Nora by noon (12pm) on October 23rd, 2017.

What is PSE?

Policy: Written Statement of organizational position, decision or course of action, such as ordinances, resolutions, mandates, guidelines, or rules

Systems: Changes in Organizational Procedures, such as personnel, resource allocation, programs

Environment: Physical, observable changes in the built, economic, and/or social environment

*More Information on PSE Available here: Healthtrust.org

What is Social Marketing?

Using proven commercial marketing techniques, like behavioral theory, persuasion psychology and marketing science, to promote changes in diverse socially important behaviors. Social Marketing is especially useful in determining health behavior, reactions to messages, and message delivery.
Washington SNAP-Ed
Instructions for the PSE Project Evaluation Form

Project Phases: All PSE and social marketing projects fall into one or more phases

Planning: This includes formative research, needs assessments, contacting stakeholders

Developing: This includes designing and testing materials, creating resources, training materials

Implementing: This is the process of putting your decision or plan into effect, executing your project’s PSE change or campaign

Tracking and Evaluation: This includes any follow-up work on your project, including measuring reach, learning about impacts of your project, and applying lessons learned

**Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form**

*Instructions* tab

The information you provide on this form will be pooled together with other PSE activities from across the state. Aggregated information will be used to identify challenges, successes, and common practices statewide. Results will be available to local agencies, implementing agencies, statewide initiatives, and DSHS. Results will also be used to fulfill annual reporting requirements.

**Please Note:** If you are having trouble with the drop-down menus, you can find the options from each list in the "Drop-Down Key." tab

### Section 1: Local Agency Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person(s) Filling Out Form:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region/Initiative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Project Information

**Project Name** (refer to the State Plan, your project proposal, or project summary sheet).

Please provide your *project description*. In other words, what is your *elevator pitch* for this project? This description will help the evaluation team compare similar projects when they analyze PSE data.

What kind of project is this (policy, systems, environment, or social marketing)? See instructions tab for definitions.

Did you do direct education as a part of this project?

Did you do indirect education as a part of this project?

Phase of project. See instructions tab for definitions:

If you selected "More than one, other," please list in the box to the

---
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## Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form

| What fiscal year did you start this project? |  |
| What is the estimated end date of this project? |  |
| Priority Population: Sex |  |
| Priority Population: Age |  |
| Priority Population: Race |  |
| Priority Population: Ethnicity |  |
| Estimated Project Impact: What is your project proposal or summary sheet? |  |
| How did you estimate reach? |  |

### Section 2: Project Information, Continued

| Project Setting: Choose a domain in Column B. Then, choose the setting in Column C. If you work in more than one setting per domain or selected "other", list your setting(s) in Column D. You must choose an item from Column E in order for Column C to populate. If you don't know what setting, refer to your Project proposal/details workbook. |  |
| Evaluation Framework Indicators: | If your project meets more than one indicator, or if you selected "other", please list the indicators your project meets in the box to the right. |  |
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## Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form

If you did indirect education as part of this project, please select three topics from the drop-down menus in the boxes to the right. If you did indirect education on more than three topics, or selected other, please list which topics you taught in the box below.

| If you did indirect education as part of this project, please select the kinds of indirect education tools you used from the drop-down menu | if you used more than one kind of indirect education tool, or if you selected other, please describe in |  |
|---|---|

Did you do a needs assessment?

If yes, please attach a copy of assessment and results when you return this form. You can include the needs assessment from your project proposal or summary sheet.

## Section 3:

### Project Goals/Strategy
In this section, please list what changes you are trying to make as a result of this PSE Project. Examples could include support strategies for healthy food procurement and storage; OR improve capacity of staff and volunteers; OR promote point of purchase prompts. Your goals can be broad, or they can be SMART. If you need help figuring out your project goals, refer to your Project Details Workbook, or the State Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Strategies</th>
<th>Did you reach this goal? Please describe your successes and challenges in the boxes below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Goal/Strategy 1:

Goal/Strategy 2:

Goal/Strategy 3:

Goal/Strategy 4:

If you have more than four goals for this project, insert more lines by highlighting the row, right clicking, and selecting insert row.
### Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were some challenges that made it harder to reach your goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were some factors that made it easier to reach your goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Section 4:

**Collaboration & Partnership Activity:** This information will be used to look at depth and breadth of relationships. In the **Reflection and Notes** section, please describe why there is a difference between planned and actual, key partnerships, strengths, and barriers. There will be more space to discuss strengths, barriers, and opportunities in the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Reflection and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many partners (organizations, site leaders, managers, etc.) did you work with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many sites or communities did you reach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many champions did you work with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many trainings for staff or technical assistance sessions did you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many policy or environmental assessments did you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many sites or partner organizations made a change based on your project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form

In the boxes below, please list the organizations or sectors you represent. Please list one partner organization per box. You may add additional rows as needed, or include a list as an attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What assistance did you receive from this partner?</th>
<th>What assistance did you provide to this partner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you received or provided more than one type of assistance, or selected other, please describe in the boxes below. If your relationship was not based on assistance, please describe the partnership in more detail. Please also describe the strength of this relationship.

If you have more than four partners for this project, insert more lines by highlighting the row, right clicking, and selecting insert row.

## Section 5: Strengths and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you say this project's major strengths were this fiscal year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see as areas for improvement for this project based on this fiscal year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking forward, what are some opportunities for this project in future fiscal years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking forward, what are some potential challenges this program might face in future fiscal years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Washington SNAP-Ed PSE Project Evaluation Form

## Section 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Materials</th>
<th>Are you attaching this to your email?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success story (examples include media recognition, one-pager highlighting your project, newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos (if you include photos, please include a photo release)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything else? Please describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of SNAP-Ed PSE Assessment Form
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Washington SNAP-Ed Evaluation

Methods:

Direct Education:

Pre- and post-tests were used to assess direct education series. Participants served as their own controls, as they took pretests before nutrition education occurred. Local agencies gave post-tests to participants after nutrition education lessons ended. The SNAP-Ed evaluation team did not assess one-time events. Cooking Matters direct education series were exempt from using the food behavior checklist because they are required to use a 36-item survey developed by the curriculum developers at Share Our Strength that addresses SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework indicators MT1 (healthy eating behaviors) and MT2 (food resource management behaviors). The local agencies who taught Cooking Matters classes returned their pre/post surveys to Solid Ground, the local lead for Cooking Matters in Washington. Solid Ground reported Cooking Matters data to the SNAP-Ed evaluation team.

Data collection: The evaluation team collected data from participants in direct education series using approved Washington SNAP-Ed curricula. Because FFY 2017’s evaluation format changed from implementing agency-led to statewide, there was a delay in procuring materials, so pre- and post-tests were not widely distributed until January 2018. The evaluation team used pre- and post-tests as primary data source. Table O1 lists the surveys used for direct education.

Sampling strategy: The evaluation team established goal sample sizes of 100 adults per region and 500 youth per region to ensure regional analyses would be possible. The sample was proportionate to the percent of participants in each curriculum, for each region, with a minimum of 35 participants per curriculum. Goal sample sizes were not reached for every curriculum or the 9th-12th grade age group.

Data analysis: Local SNAP-Ed providers entered direct education program activity data into PEARS. Local SNAP-Ed providers and Implementing Agencies entered survey data into PEARS. The evaluation team exported program activity data by region, and survey data by survey. Exporting survey data by region or implementing agency is not possible in PEARS. Once exported, the evaluation team cleaned and aggregated data, and performed descriptive statistics. The evaluation team did not conduct hypothesis testing or tests for statistical significance for this report. Results are based on percent of participants categorized by self-reported answer choice.

Policy, Systems, and Environment (PSE) Pilot Evaluation:

In Washington, local agencies and Implementing agencies approached PSE projects using a variety of methods, targeting diverse audience, and approached at different levels. Because of the wide range of PSE activities, existing tools did not meet the needs of the SNAP-Ed evaluation team. The evaluation team created a pilot PSE assessment tool (appendix 1), based on both the EARS form and Arizona SNAP-Ed’s semi-annual report and template. Local agencies had the option report their PSE activities both to their implementing agency and the evaluation team using either completed this tool, or the PEARS PSE
Module, or only to their implementing agency using other methods. The results from the projects submitted either via the PEARs PSE module or via the Washington PSE assessment form were aggregated, and analyzed by indicator, reach, and setting.

**University of Washington Center for Public Health Nutrition Farmer’s Market Access Evaluation:**

A team of external evaluators with the University of Washington’s Center for Public Health Nutrition (UW CPHN) conducted statewide farmer’s market surveys in both 2015 and 2016. Ninety-four markets completed the survey for a 58% response rate. The team also completed interviews with 36 SNAP-Ed and Farmer’s Market Key Stakeholders in 2016 and 2017. Stakeholders included farmer’s market managers, SNAP-Ed providers, state farmer’s market leaders, and nutrition educators. Finally, in 2016, the team surveyed 400 SNAP recipients in the state of Washington who live near farmer’s markets with a range of farmer’s market activities. Qualitative results were themed, quantitative findings were analyzed, and UW CPHN created five briefs describing their results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Education</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT1 Healthy Eating (I/O)</td>
<td>K-2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: Eat Well and Move K-2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade Nutrition Education Survey</td>
<td>Visually Enhanced Food Behavior Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT2 Food Resource Management (I/O)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visually Enhanced Food Behavior Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT3 Physical Activity &amp; Reduced Sedentary Behavior (I/O)</td>
<td>K-2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: Eat Well and Move K-2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade Nutrition Education Survey</td>
<td>International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade: EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade EFNEP Nutrition Education Survey for 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative, Process, PSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5 Need and Readiness (Formative/PSE)</td>
<td>PEARS PSE Module</td>
<td>Washington State’s PSE Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6 Local Champions (Formative/PSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results:

Participant data: In FFY 2017, 61037 people participated in direct education activities in Washington, reaching 6.5% of those who used SNAP benefits in Washington in FFY 2017, based on USDA SNAP participation data. A note on duplication: local SNAP-Ed providers counted participants for every direct education activity as separate interventions. If a participant took part in two different series, they may have been counted twice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 footnote: Male (M), Female (F), Unknown (U). Unknown includes activities where gender was not recorded for one or more participants.
Demographic data for race and ethnicity are not linked to gender and age group data in PEARS so they are not represented here.

Table 2. Primary curriculum by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2017 Approved Curriculum</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>No. Series</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>No. Series</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>No. Series</td>
<td>Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose Health, Food, Fun and Fitness</td>
<td>Grades 3-6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters (CM)</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM at the Store</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM in Your Community</td>
<td>Adults, Seniors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM in Your Food Pantry</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat Healthy - Be Active</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat Smart, Live Strong</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Smart, Being Active</td>
<td>Adults, Seniors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energize your Life!</td>
<td>Adults, Seniors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Your Options</td>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazin' With Marty Moose - WSU Edition</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Healthy Habits</td>
<td>Grades K-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids in the Kitchen</td>
<td>Grades 1-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Smart Youth</td>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyPlate in Practice</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition in Me</td>
<td>Grades 3-4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition to Grow on</td>
<td>Grades 4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Voyage</td>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick a Better Snack and Act</td>
<td>Grades K-3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Shop, Save &amp; Cook</td>
<td>Adults, Seniors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read for Health - WSU Edition</td>
<td>Grades 1-2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReFresh</td>
<td>Grades 4-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethink Your Drink</td>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Me Nutrition</td>
<td>Grades K-8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up for the Challenge</td>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>19634</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Direct Education Evaluation:**

Direct education evaluation focused on describing direct education and on outcomes relating to indicators MT1 (healthy eating), MT2 (food resource management), and MT3 (physical activity and sedentary behavior).

Twenty-five approved direct education curricula were taught in Washington (table 2), as well as a variety of direct education activities that did not relate to a particular curriculum, or a curriculum on the “approved” list (table 2a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Education Activity (DEA)</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. DEA</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>No. DEA</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>No. DEA</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>No. DEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;N/A&quot;</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>18226</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>6037</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Event</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERNEL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyPlate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat together, Eat better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>18281</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>7575</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Education Outcome Evaluation:**

**K-2nd grades:** In FFY 2017, 1863 K-2nd graders took a pre-test and 1828 took a post-test. The data for the K-2nd grade survey, Eat Well + Move, were disorganized due limitations of PEARS, so the data were not included in this report. Additional analysis on FFY 2017 K-2nd grade data will take place in FFY 2018, focusing on change in knowledge of fruits and vegetables (ST1), and physical activity (ST3) between pre- and post-education.
3rd-5th grades: In FFY 2017, 4739 3rd-5th graders took a pre-test and 4417 took a post-test, using EFNEP’s 3rd-5th grade nutrition education survey. This survey assesses self-reported behaviors, intentions, and knowledge of healthy eating (MT1), physical activity (MT3), and food safety (ST4). While this survey is widely used throughout the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program (EFNEP) and SNAP-Ed, the evaluation team noted that it has an uneven Likert scale, and that the long words and questions may be above a 3rd-grader’s reading level, which may influence the quality of response. The evaluation team will perform additional analyses on these data in FFY 2018.

Figure DE1 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating vegetables. Not much change occurred between pre- and post-nutrition education, but the reduction in percent of students who responded “some days” and small increases in percent of students who responded that they eat vegetables “most days” and “every day” could be indicative of a potential trend with additional data.

Figure DE2 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating fruit. Not much change occurred between pre- and post-nutrition education. Small increase in percent of students who report they ate fruit “every day” after education and the small decrease in percent of students who report they ate fruit “some days” could indicate potential behavior change. Statistical tests for significance will take place in FFY 2018.
Figure DE3 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of participating in physical activities. Less change is observed between pre- and post-nutrition education for this question compared to the two about healthy eating behaviors. This is unsurprising, as many curricula teach nutrition education, and do not address physical activity. Statistical tests for significance will take place in FFY 2018.

6th-8th grades: In FFY 2017, 1762 6th-8th graders took EFNEP’s 6th-8th grade nutrition education survey and 1828 took a post-test. This survey addresses SNAP-Ed evaluation framework indicators MT1, MT3 and MT4.

Figure DE4 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating vegetables. Increases in the percent of students who reported they ate vegetables 2 or more times per day was observed in conjunction with decreases in the percent of students who reported they ate vegetables zero or one time per day after education. This could indicate that increased exposure to vegetables and increased knowledge about the benefits of vegetables plays a role in increased vegetable consumption.

Figure DE5 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating fruit. Not much change was observed in percent of students reporting each frequency of eating fruit between pre- and post-education. Small increases in percent of students reporting they ate fruit two or more times were observed. Additional tests for significance will be done in FFY 2018.
9th-12th grade: The EFNEP 9th-12th grade nutrition education survey was given to high school aged participants in series curricula. Sixty-six participants took a pre-test and 17 took a post-test. This survey addresses SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework Indicators MT1, MT2, MT3, and MT4. Because the sample is so small for this age group, these data are not generalizable and could vary greatly with an increased sample size. Tests for significance will not be done for this age group due to small sample size.

Figure DE6 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating vegetables. Anecdotally, increases in the percent of participants reporting they ate vegetables two or more times per day after nutrition education were observed. A similar decrease in percent of participants reporting they ate vegetables zero or one time per day was observed. The sample size for the post-test was small so no test for significance will be done.

Figure DE7 shows the percent of participants by self-reported frequency of eating fruit. Anecdotally, we see a large increase in percent of students who report they ate fruit two or more times per day after nutrition education compared to before. We also observed a similar decrease in percent of students reporting they ate fruit one or zero times per day after education compared to before. While this finding could potentially be indicative of nutrition education leading to behavior change, no statistical tests for significance will be done due to the small sample size.
**Food Behavior Checklist:** The visually enhanced food behavior checklist was given to all adults who participated in a series curriculum. Eight-hundred-seventy-three participants took a pre-test and 486 took a post-test. This survey addresses SNAP-Ed evaluation framework indicators MT1 and MT2. Additional analyses on the results from this evaluation tool will be done in FFY 2018.

Figure DE8 shows the percent of participants by self-reported usual volume of fruit consumed per day. Increases in percent of participants responding that they ate 2 cups or more of fruit per day after nutrition education, along with decreases in percent of participants reporting they ate one cup or less of fruit per day indicates that nutrition education may play a role in increasing fruit consumption behaviors.

Figure DE9 shows the percent of participants by self-reported usual volume of vegetables consumed per day. Modest increases in percent of participants reporting they ate 1.5-2.5 cups of vegetables per day. Decreases were observed in percent of participants reporting they ate 0-0.5 cups of vegetables per day.
Figure DE10 shows the percent of participants by answer choice for the question on food resource management. A larger percent of participants, 49% they do not run out of food before the end of the month after nutrition education, compared to before, at 37%. This finding could indicate that adult SNAP-Ed classes help participants learn how to spend their food-dollars more effectively.

**International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ):** The IPAQ survey was given to adults who participated in a curriculum with a physical activity component. The IPAQ has seven questions in which participants self-report the frequency and duration of various physical activity and sedentary behaviors. In FFY 2017, 449 adults took an IPAQ pre-test and 212 took a post-test. Analyses on additional questions and hypothesis testing will take place in FFY 2018.

Figure DE11 shows the percent of participants by frequency of walking. A larger percent of participants report that they walked between 5-7 days in the last week after direct education compared to before education. Reinforcing that finding is the smaller percent of participants who report they walked 0-2 days in the last week after direct education compared to before education.
Figure DE12 shows the percent of participants by frequency of moderate-intensity activities. Similar to the data we see in figure DE11, DE12 shows that 59% of participants reported that they did moderate-intensity physical activities between 5-7 days in the last week after direct education compared to 21% of participants before education. The decrease in percent of participants reporting that they did 0-2 days of moderate-intensity physical activity in the last week after education from 52% of participants to 17% of participants reinforces the finding that participants do moderate-intensity physical activities more often after nutrition education.

Cooking Matters:

In FFY 2017, 311 adults participated in Cooking Matters series classes. Of those, all 311 took pre-tests, and 239 took post-tests. Outcomes of interest in Washington relate to change behaviors relating to fruit and vegetable consumption, pertaining to MT1, and resources to purchase food throughout the month, pertaining to MT2. The Cooking Matters survey has questions that map to fruit, vegetable, and food resource management, and we noticed change between pre- and post-tests. Hypothesis testing for statistical significance will take place in FFY 2018.

Figure DE13 shows percent of participants by answer choice for both pre-test and post-test for the question on vegetables, not including beans and potatoes. A larger percent of participants report that they eat vegetables more than once a day, up to 16% of participants after nutrition education compared to just 8% of participants before nutrition education.
Figure DE14 shows percent of participants by answer choice for both pre-test and post-test for the question on fruits. A larger percent of participants ate fruit more than once a week after the Cooking Matters series, compared to the before. Two notable changes between pre- and post-tests are the drop from 18% of participants to 8% of participants reporting that they ate fruit once a week are less, and the increase from 23% of participants to 32% of participants who reported that they ate fruit more than once a day compared to before nutrition education.

Figure DE15 shows percent of participants by answer choice for both pre-test and post-test for the question on food resource management. While there were small decreases in the percent of participants who sometimes, often, or always worry about running out of food before they have money to buy more, there was an increase in the percent of participants who report that they never or rarely worry about running out of food after the series. While this result is an intended outcome of this curriculum, the fact that participants get additional food resources while they take this class may confound results.

Direct Education Evaluation Conclusions:

Findings from direct education evaluation are promising. We observed changes in behavior in many of the questions of interest, pertaining to healthy eating behaviors, food resource management behaviors,
and physical activity behaviors. While we cannot say for sure that SNAP-Ed activities are associated with positive behavior change until we test for statistical significance, the trends are promising that Washington SNAP-Ed met its state goal.

**Direct Education Evaluation Limitations:**

FFY 2017 was a transition year for evaluation, resulting in a delay in evaluation tool distribution and changes in evaluation reporting strategy throughout the year. Evaluation tools were not distributed until January 2017 and local providers were not trained on how to proctor evaluation tools. Outcome data in this report corresponds to direct education series conducted January 2017-September 2017.

Additionally, the change in reporting system to PEARS was not accounted for in all budgets. This resulted in data entry being conducted on multiple levels, and inconsistent program activity data entry in different regions. Some local agencies entered program activities as individual sessions rather than as a series in PEARS, which could have had major impacts on our summary data.

All data was self-reported by the participant, which could be may be unreliable.

The evaluation did not measure the effect of multiple interventions. Some local SNAP-Ed providers conducted PSE projects and direct education at the same sites. Some local providers may have taught more than one curriculum to the same participant, so there may be some reach duplication.

**Farmer’s Market Access Evaluation**

University of Washington’s Center for Public Health Nutrition conducted an evaluation of farmer’s market access activities, which primarily used PSE strategies, supported by Washington SNAP-Ed in FFY 2015-FFY 2017. The purpose of their evaluation was to describe these farmer’s market access activities, and present Washington SNAP participants’ farmers market shopping patterns, experiences with SNAP-Ed activities, and their fruit and vegetable consumption.

In 2016 fifty percent of WA SNAP participants shopped at a farmers market; 30% shopped at markets once per month or more. Twenty percent of WA SNAP participants in 2016 participated in a SNAP-Ed activity. SNAP participants who participate in SNAP-Ed activities were significantly more likely to have shopped at farmers markets. In turn, SNAP participants who shopped at farmers markets consumed fruit and vegetables more times per day on average than SNAP recipients who did not shop at farmers markets. SNAP participants’ farmers market shopping patterns and activity participation and awareness differed by demographics. SNAP participants who participated in food banks or the WIC program were also significantly more likely to have shopped at farmers markets compared to SNAP recipients who did not participate in these programs. Over 92% of SNAP recipients stated that they enjoyed eating fruit and vegetables, and believed that fruit and vegetables should be included in meals and snacks.

**Key Findings:**
In Washington in 2016, there were 343 farmer’s market food access activities across 94 farmer’s markets. Washington SNAP-Ed Contractors and their partners (e.g., local public health jurisdictions, extension programs, neighborhood farmers markets, and region-based farmers market ‘Regional Leads’) developed and implemented food access programming to support increased farmers market shopping among SNAP participants and other low-income communities. Most of these entities either received SNAP-Ed funding or collaborated with SNAP-Ed funded partners to do this work.

Of a random sample of Washington State SNAP recipients, 50% of survey respondents (n=197) reported shopping at farmers markets, and 20% (n=80) reported participating in SNAP-Ed-like activities. SNAP recipients reported overwhelmingly positive experiences with both farmers market shopping, and SNAP-Ed-like activity participation.

SNAP participants who participated in SNAP-Ed-like activities were significantly more likely to have shopped at a farmer’s market. SNAP participants who shopped at farmers markets consumed fruit and vegetables more times per day on average than SNAP participants who did not shop at farmers markets. These associations remained true when controlling for education, age, race, and gender.

In a zero-inflated Poisson model of frequency of shopping at a farmers market, individual participation in a SNAP-Ed-like activity significantly predicted farmers market shopping. An individual who participated in a SNAP-Ed-like activity was more likely to have shopped at a farmers market or to have shopped at a farmers market more frequently than SNAP participants who had not participated in these SNAP-Ed activities. SNAP participants who identified as female, Asian, or had achieved a college degree were also significantly more likely to have shopped at farmers markets.

Furthermore, SNAP participants’ participation in the WIC program or in food banks was significantly associated with increased farmers market shopping. UW CPHN hypothesize that SNAP-Ed’s contributions to multi-sector partner development, demonstrated by the number of SNAP-Ed contractors partnering across farmers markets, food banks, and WIC, may facilitate this association between WIC participation, food bank usage, and farmers market shopping.

More information on the SNAP-Ed Farmer’s Market Access Evaluation can be found immediately following this section.
Where do these data and findings come from?

1. In both 2015 and 2016 statewide we conducted a farmers market survey of all Washington State farmers markets. 94 markets completed the survey for a 58% response rate.
2. We completed interviews with 86 SNAP-Ed and Farmers Market Key Stakeholders in 2016 and 2017. Stakeholders included farmers market managers, SNAP-Ed education contractors, state farmers market leaders, and nutrition educators.
3. We surveyed 480 SNAP Recipients in the state of Washington who live near farmers markets. We surveyed individuals in 2016, from communities with a range of farmers market food access activities and SNAP-Ed work (including communities with many and few or no food access activities).

Who supported this study?

This project was supported by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture under an appropriation to the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services ("SNAP 2 year Nutrition Education and Obesity"). An Advisory Group co-chaired by WA DOH and Washington State farmers Market Association (WSFMA) advised this study; members included market managers, WSFMA food access regional leads, nutrition educators, WIC staff, and SNAP-Ed Contractors and Washington State University Extension leaders. The National SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework guided this study.

This information or content and conclusions should be construed as the official position or policy of, nor should any endorsements be inferred from FNPI, USDA or the U.S. Government. We would like to thank the community partners and stakeholders who helped us arrange, and/or participated in interviews and surveys for this research.

Key Terms:

1. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed): SNAP-Ed is an evidence-based program that helps people lead healthier lives. SNAP-Ed teaches people using or eligible for SNAP about good nutrition and how to make their food dollars stretch further. SNAP-Ed participants also learn to be physically active. SNAP-Ed works by building partnerships with all types of community organizations.
2. SNAP-Ed Contractor: An organization or individual funded by SNAP-Ed to carry out SNAP-Ed activities.
3. Food Access Activity / SNAP-Ed Like Activity: Nutrition education activities/programs, and policy, systems, and environment change efforts implemented with the goal of increasing access to affordable, healthy foods for SNAP-eligible individuals. Most of the activities in this evaluation explore SNAP-Ed funded. However we refer to all activities as “Food access activities” or “SNAP-Ed like activities” because at times the funding source is unknown while the intent and goals of the program are the same as those funded by SNAP-Ed.
4. Policy, Systems, and Environment (PSE): PSE change efforts improve communities at a high, structural level.
5. Washington State Farmers Market Regional Leads (WSFMA Regional Leads): WSFMA Regional Leads are individuals funded by SNAP-Ed, who contract with the Washington State Farmers Market Association and their partner organizations. These individuals have the goal of building collaborative networks to support increased access to farmers markets for low-income shoppers.
6. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program / Electronic Benefits Transfer (SNAP/EBT): SNAP/EBT is the money and transfer system by which USDA provides eligible low-income individuals with financial support to afford food.
7. Women, Infants, and Children Program (WIC) and the Farmers Market Nutrition Incentive Program (FMNP) at markets: WIC and FMNP (both funded by USDA) provide women and seniors, respectively, with coupon incentives to purchase healthy foods at farmers markets.
8. Food Insecurity by Nutrition Incentives (FNI): FNI is a USDA-funded program that provides funding for farmers markets to provide nutrition incentives (i.e. additional money to spend on healthy foods) for eligible low-income shoppers.

Please contact* the University of Washington, Center for Public Health Nutrition with any questions. Visit www.cohn.org for more study information, findings, and analysis.

Donna Johnson, PhD, Principal Investigator  
djohn@uw.edu
*Eimee Quinn, MPH, Research Manager  
equinn1@uw.edu | 206-616-7962
Lisa Pinero Walkinchaw, MPH, Research Coordinator  
wwalkinchaw@uw.edu | 206-616-0350
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Funding cuts and insufficient funding

Shift away from nutrition education

Policy, systems and environment (PSE) changes

Statewide reorganization and transparency

When faced with budget cuts, farmers market programs are among the first programs SNAP-Ed funded partners cut. Unreliable funding makes it hard to build long-term partnerships. Sustainable partnerships require ongoing and constant engagement.

"...if we don’t have enough funding to staff a program, it’s hard to expand into farmers markets if you’re not doing it already."
— SNAP-Ed Contractor

Nutrition education has been at the heart of SNAP-Ed’s identity. SNAP-Ed stakeholders see the benefits of including PSE approaches even despite transition challenges.

“...direct education work is meeting people on the ground and promoting improved nutrition... PSE work is changing the system to make it easier for those people... Those [PSE] efforts... I see, as the way everybody does, as the most sustainable ones. So I don’t want to drop the direct education completely, but I can see that SNAP might be going that direction.”
— SNAP-Ed Contractor

It has been hard to adapt to SNAP-Ed’s increasing PSE focus:
- New approaches required for PSE work were hard for non-Public Health folks
- "PSE" term hard to understand without concrete examples
- Insufficient guidance as to what PSE means and what types of PSE work is possible in practice
- Difficulty to do both direct education and PSE well
- Desire for support in understanding how to measure and evaluate SNAP-Ed work

Market stakeholders are starting to get more comfortable with PSE.

In 2016 WA changed how it administered SNAP-Ed contracts, turning the state into 5 regions & affecting who worked together. This was hard, and moving forward SNAP-Ed contractors suggested:
- Clarify how & where SNAP-Ed funding will support farmers market work
- Support connections with new regional partners
- Coordinate across funded partners
- Increase funding
- Develop clear metrics for measurement & evaluation

Overall this reorganization improved collaboration on PSEs in farmers markets.
Washington State Farmers Markets
SNAP-Ed Partnerships

Spring 2017

Washington SNAP-Ed contractor multi-sector partnerships

60% of all WA SNAP-Ed contractors worked with markets in 2016
at least 60% worked with markets on policy, systems & environment (PSE) changes, mainly market outreach and nutrition incentives
at least 40% worked with markets on nutrition education, mainly kids activities, peer-to-peer programs, cooking classes, and nutrition education in the markets

SNAP-Ed stakeholders described WSFMA Regional Leads as a top engaged food access market partner.

To do farmers market food access work SNAP-Ed contractors most often partnered with:
1. Farmers markets
2. Public health departments
3. Food banks and other community food programs
4. Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive (FINI) program
5. WSFMA Regional Leads

To do farmers market food access work Regional Leads most often partnered with:
1. Farmers markets
2. Community organizations
3. Public health departments
4. DSHS

Pierce County (1 of 7) WSFMA Regional Lead partnership network examples:
- 8 markets total
- 5 “connected” markets who share partners
- 29 partners total
- 3 “disconnected” markets

An opportunity to “weave the network” by connecting the 3 disconnected markets.

There is an opportunity to further build collaboration between SNAP-Ed contractors and WSFMA Regional Leads, who already share many common partners.

Washington State Farmers Markets
SNAP-Ed Partnerships

Facilitating multi-sector collaboration
SNAP-Ed contractors and farmers market leaders build strong collaborations thru:
- In-person networking
- Common needs and shared experiences
- Mutually beneficial projects
- Sharing data & info
- Clear expectations and roles

There are many SNAP-Ed funded organizations and programs in WA working with communities through a variety of farmers market food access activities and systems change efforts.

As the regional lead... the amount of networking opportunities... that opens up the window of opportunity for my farmers market programs... it’s tremendous WSFMA and the resources that they have to tap into... supporting a unified vision to increased access to markets.”

- WSFMA Regional Lead

59% of markets named ≥3 food access partners
34% of markets named zero food access partners

Farmers market partnership network
WA farmers markets, connected to their food access partners

Farmers markets’ most common food access partners
1. Women, Infants, and Children program (WIC)
2. WA State University Extension (WSU)
3. Department of Social & Health Services (DSHS)
4. WA State Farmers Market Association (WSFMA)

Created as part of a USDA-funded statewide evaluation of SNAP-Education (SNAP-Ed) and WA farmers markets food access. Advisory Group co-chairs include WA Department of Health (WA DOH) and WA State Farmers Market Association (WSFMA). Visit www.cphn.org for an outline of our methods, and more findings.
SNAP-Ed community food access activities

Food access activities often included:
1. Advertising markets and SNAP/EBT at markets
2. Nutrition Incentives
3. Fruit + vegetable prescription programs
4. Training farmers market staff and vendors on incentives and SNAP/EBT
5. Cooking classes + demonstrations
6. Market tours or mock markets
7. Peer-to-peer programs
8. Kids activities
9. Transportation support
10. Technical assistance to increase # of markets accepting SNAP/EBT
11. Farmers market education or information-sharing in SNAP-Ed nutrition courses

Activity deep dive: peer-to-peer programs

Peer-to-peer programs recruit and train community members to work within their own communities (primarily lower-income, and racially & ethnically diverse) to share information in accessible, culturally appropriate ways. The role of peer educators is to promote the health of community members by providing health information, resources, or referrals in an informal, and culturally relevant way. Several WA SNAP-Ed contractors use peer-to-peer programs to support market access.

In interviews, peer educators and program participants of 3 SNAP-Ed supported WA programs reported that their peer-to-peer farmers market program:
- Helped them learn more about how to use and access farmers markets
- Increased their shopping at farmers markets
- Increased the amount of fruit + vegetables they ate
- Helped them see their community in a "much broader way"
- Enabled them to provide their farmers market with feedback about supporting low-income shoppers
- Increased their interactions with individuals in their own communities

Washington State Farmers Markets
Improving Community Food Access

Washington State Farmers Markets
Improving Community Food Access

Working across Washington

Making markets affordable & SNAP-friendly

Using SNAP-Ed funding

Partnering across communities

90% of markets reported accepting SNAP/EBT, WIC, or Senior FMNP.

74 markets advertised these programs; 58 trained staff & vendors about them.

In 2016 across WA there were many reported food access activities, for example:
- 52 cooking classes and food demonstration programs
- 48 SNAP/EBT incentive programs
- 26 kids activity programs
- 25 market tour or mock market programs
- 18 fruit and vegetable prescription programs
- 14 peer-to-peer programs

It costs time + money to do this work.

SNAP-Ed funding increased farmers markets’ capacity to do community food access work. SNAP-Ed funded “contractors” built partner networks and supported programming.

“it wouldn’t be happening without SNAP-Ed. I mean it would be zero…. It’s not work that any market, or any farmer, or any non-profit organization working with low income people would be able to pay for on its own.”

– Farmers Market Manager

343 food access activities by markets & their partners across 84 markets; 43 activities new in 2016

61% of markets partnered with senior centers

59% of markets partnered with public health agencies

58% of markets partnered with food banks

Multi-sector partners built strong local food systems & increased access to healthy foods.
Washington State Farmers Markets Food Access Successes

Spring 2017

Increased partnering and collaboration

Market managers, SNAP-Ed contractors and WSFMA Regional Leads have built collaborative community partnerships.

SNAP-Ed funded PSE efforts supported increased partner collaboration that improved market environments.

SNAP-Ed PSE approaches improved market experiences for SNAP shoppers.

Kids activities live markets and funders like supporting them.

53% of market managers believed voucher and incentive programs were the #1 way their market supports low-income shoppers.

33% of market managers believed outreach and marketing is the #1 way they drive low-income shoppers to their markets.

PSE successes include collaborative multi-sector partner networks (e.g., relationships between markets, Public Health, DSHS, transit, and nonprofits). Partners help markets advertise & do community outreach.

53% of market managers believed voucher and incentive programs were the #1 way their market supports low-income shoppers.

33% of market managers believed outreach and marketing is the #1 way they drive low-income shoppers to their markets.

SNAP-Ed Regional Lead

Washington State Farmers Market Access Evaluation
University of Washington Center for Public Health Nursing

Created as part of a USDA-funded statewide evaluation of SNAP-Education (SNAP-Ed) and WA farmers market food access. Advisory Group Co-Chairs include WA Department of Health (WA DOH) and WA State Farmers Market Association (WSFMA).

Visit www.cohn.org for an outline of our methods, and more findings.

Washington State Farmers Markets Challenges to Serving Low-Income Families

Spring 2017

Accepting SNAP/EBT at farmers markets

69% of surveyed markets accepted SNAP/EBT

43% of surveyed markets accepted a nutrition incentive other than SNAP/EBT/WIC, or FMNP

It is time intensive and expensive for markets to accept SNAP/EBT.

SNAP/EBT acceptance is a challenge due to:

• Time
• Cost
• Staff
• Training
• Location
• Languages
• Networking

Every farmers market manager ever the first thing they’ll tell you is that they have very little time and tons of work, but at the same time, they know the market better than anyone... because of that, they are the best advocate for [food access programming] and the best one to be making decisions about [the program].

Market Manager

Outreach is a challenge due to:

• Time
• Cost
• Staff
• Training
• Location
• Languages
• Networking

Every market season we run the risk of running out of dollars for matching.

"Breaking the impression that we serve an elite population.”

"Reaching those in need.

Markets need community data to support their food access work (e.g., shopper demographics, best places for outreach, SNAP/EBT spending and incentives at markets).

It is hard for markets to build effective programs without understanding their target shoppers.

Created as part of a USDA-funded statewide evaluation of SNAP-Education (SNAP-Ed) and WA farmers market food access. Advisory Group Co-Chairs include WA Department of Health (WA DOH) and WA State Farmers Market Association (WSFMA).

Visit www.cohn.org for an outline of our methods, and more findings.
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Washington State Department of Health
Background

In 2015, the Washington State Department of Health and over 60 multi-sector partners were awarded a $5.86 million competitive Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive (FINI) grant by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. FINI funds support nutrition incentive programs that make it easier for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants to afford more fruits and vegetables. FINI is comprised of three distinct nutrition incentive strategies: Fruit and Vegetable Rx, Farmers Market Match, and Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons.

For more information about the FINI grant and all three strategies, visit www.doh.wa.gov/FINI or www.doh.wa.gov/CompleteEats.

This toolkit focuses on the Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons strategy, which launched in June 2017. Department of Health and Safeway are teaming up to offer the new program for shoppers who use SNAP. Shoppers who buy at least $10 worth of qualifying fruits and vegetables using their SNAP food benefits and their Safeway Club Card will get a coupon for $5 off their next purchase. Shoppers can choose from fresh, canned and frozen fruits and vegetables, so long as the products have no added fats, sugars or salt.

Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons are available at all 170 Safeway stores in Washington and is expected to run through June 2019. This is among the nation’s first SNAP nutrition incentive programs available in large-chain grocery stores. For more information visit www.doh.wa.gov/CompleteEats.

Good to know about Fruit and Vegetable Rx Program

- Select health system partners, Department of Health, and Safeway are also working together to distribute Fruit and Vegetable Prescriptions redeemable at all Safeway stores in Washington. The program is called Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Rx.

- This is a different program than Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons, but there are similarities. Patients who receive a $10 cash-value Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Rx can buy fresh, canned or frozen fruits and vegetables with no added fats, sugars or salt at Safeway stores, just like the Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons.

- Key difference: the Rx is a $10 cash-value voucher and can be used without an EBT purchase, whereas the Coupons require a $10 EBT purchase of qualifying fruits and vegetables.
How SNAP-Ed contractors can play a role in Complete Eats

A major challenge to the rollout of Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons has been educating store staff about the program and how it works. In early June 2017, Safeway’s Division-level front end management team conducted a series of Complete Eats webinars for store managers and directors. However, programming at the local stores is inconsistent, which creates confusion and frustration for SNAP customers and service providers who are promoting Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons.

SNAP-Ed contractors can play an important role in supporting Safeway store staff in their knowledge of the Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons and ensure successful program implementation.

Engaging and supporting Safeway store staff in their knowledge of Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons aligns with policy, system, and/or environmental changes in the retail environment to increase purchases of healthy foods among SNAP participants. This activity can be included in your SNAP-Ed work plan, pending approval from Implementing Agencies. Outreach to Safeway stores can also serve as an entrée into other store activities like grocery store tours and nutrition education provided in-store.

Potential SNAP-Ed activities:

1. Develop a relationship with SNAP-Ed qualified retailers (Safeway stores) with the goal of increasing access to fruit and vegetables among SNAP participants.

2. Support SNAP-Ed qualified retailers (Safeway stores) in their knowledge and promotion of Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons.

3. Communicate any local issues about Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons to Department of Health FINI team.

4. Check-in with SNAP-Ed participants about their experience with Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons. For example, if agencies promote Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons in classes, ask how things are going when they use the coupons. Report any issues to Department of Health FINI team.

5. Look at ways you could offer direct education to SNAP-Ed participants via grocery store tours, food demos, or class series as part of current approved plan.

This toolkit outlines strategies to approach local Safeway store managers and support them and their staff to ensure successful implementation of Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons.
Approaching and offering assistance to Store Managers and Staff

Connecting with Safeway managers and staff in-person is an important first step to making sure Complete Eats runs smoothly. Steps to engaging with store staff:

1. Visit the Safeway store in-person. See Safeway Store Location and Contact List for Complete Eats attachment (this will be localized to your SNAP-Ed geographic reach and a qualified SNAP-Ed sites).

2. Ask to speak with the front-end manager or store manager, depending on availability.

3. Let managers know what agency you work for and that you are partnering with Washington State Department of Health to make sure Complete Eats Fruits and Vegetable Coupons runs smoothly in Safeway stores.

4. Ask the manager if he/she is aware of Complete Eats?

5. Offer assistance. Is there anything you can do to support the store on Complete Eats implementation and promotion? For example:
   - Support store/staff understanding the program.
   - Promotion and education of SNAP customers.
   - Understand individual store barriers and support possible solutions to these barriers.

   Some potential ways you could support the store and address barriers:
   - Is it helpful for you to train cashiers and customer service on the program?
   - Does staff need clarification on what counts as a qualifying purchase?
   - Have staff seen Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons print out at checkout? If no, contact FINI@doh.wa.gov (see Coupon Troubleshooting section).

6. Share store-level educational and promotional materials, as applicable (see Education Materials for Safeway Staff and In-Store Signage sections). Ask managers:
   - Is the Complete Eats Produce Promotion one-pager next to the time clock?
   - Do check stands and customer service have the two-sided Complete Eats Bulletin Binder Insert?
   - Can the Complete Eats Poster be placed in the produce section? (**Note, not all stores will allow this.**) 
   - Are Complete Eats Shelf Tags placed on canned and frozen fruits and vegetables with no added fats, sugars, or salt?

7. Thank the manager for his/her time, and leave your contact information.

Useful tips:
- In-person meetings are best. Visit the store in-person, rather than contacting through email or phone.
- Keep meeting short and to-the-point.
- Management can continually change. It is good to check-in with the store managers and staff on a regular basis if SNAP participants bring up issues.
- Cashiers and managers have a lot of promotions to remember and they constantly change.
Educational materials for Safeway Staff

Safeway stores should have these materials to educate staff about the Complete Eats programs.

Complete Eats Produce Promotion one-pager (see Appendix)

This one-pager was sent to all stores and should already be next to the time clock, so cashiers are reminded about the program when they start their shifts.

This includes information about Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons and Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Prescription programs (operating in select health systems, and redeemable at any Safeway in WA).

Complete Eats Bulletin Binder Insert (see Appendix)

This two-sided document was sent to all stores and should already be at check stands and customer service. This explains the basics of the Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons to cashiers and is used to quickly reference when cashiers are helping SNAP customers.

The backside includes information about the Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Prescription program (operating in select health systems, and redeemable at any Safeway in WA).

Good to know about educational materials for Safeway staff

- The materials in the appendix have already been shared with Safeway stores across the state. They were sent to Safeway store managers from Safeway’s Division-level front end management team.

- Managers and cashier might reference the programs by different names:
  
  - Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons known as “Complete Eats Catalina coupons” – Catalina is the company that operates the coupon printer.
  
  - Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Prescription known as “Fruit and Vegetable Prescription Produce Vouchers”.

Complete Eats is supported in part by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under award number 2015-70018-23357. For more information, visit www.doh.wa.gov/FINI or email us at FINI@doh.wa.gov.
### Additional Educational Materials

It may be helpful to have the most recently updated [Frequently Asked Questions](www.doh.wa.gov/CompleteEats) document, available online at [www.doh.wa.gov/CompleteEats](www.doh.wa.gov/CompleteEats). You can reference this document if store staff have questions about the *Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupons*. For a quick guide to determine if fruits and vegetables qualify for Complete Eats:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifies</th>
<th>Does not qualify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fresh</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fresh fruits and vegetables that include added dressings, syrups or sauces.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any variety of fresh fruits and vegetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Products with syrups, sauces, seasoning or added fats, sugar and salt (sodium).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned vegetables and beans with “No Salt Added”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit canned in 100% juice or water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frozen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Products with syrups, sauces, seasoning or added fats, sugar and salt (sodium).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any variety of frozen fruits and vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-fried frozen potatoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In-store signage

Safeway stores might not have in-store signage about the Complete Eats programs.

Complete Eats Shelf Tags
All stores were sent shelf tags. The shelf tags should be near canned and frozen fruits and vegetables that have no added fats, sugars, or salt. Some stores do not have shelf tags up. However, it may be helpful to have shelf tags up for SNAP customers.

Complete Eats Poster
Posters were sent to community-based partners, not stores. This is a sturdy poster (approximately 24” x 28”) that can be placed in an ironman in the fresh produce section.

SNAP-Ed contractors can order free Complete Eats posters by emailing FINI@doh.wa.gov. Posters are available in English and Spanish.

Useful tips:
- Ask the manager to put a Complete Eats Fruit and Vegetable Coupon poster in the produce section.
- Check to see if shelf tags are near canned and frozen items with no added fats, sugars, or salt.
- If staff are unsure what canned and frozen items qualify for Complete Eats, show some examples like canned tomatoes with no added salt or fruit cups packed in 100% juice.
- Be patient with staff—it can take time to learn about added fats, sugars, and salt. This can be a nutrition education opportunity!
Coupon troubleshooting

If you hear from SNAP-Ed participants or Safeway staff that the *Complete Eat Fruit and Vegetable Coupons* are not printing out as expected, contact Department of Health FINI team at FINI@doh.wa.gov. You can also encourage the Safeway manager to contact Safeway’s Division Front End Manager.

Encourage SNAP participants who don’t receive coupons after a qualifying purchase to do the following:

1. Visit the Safeway customer service counter and present receipt showing qualifying purchase with SNAP/EBT card. Customer service can issue coupons; OR

2. Contact Washington State Department of Health by emailing FINI@doh.wa.gov or call 360-236-3287 with the following information:
   - Name
   - Mailing address
   - Safeway Club Card number OR phone number affiliated with the Safeway Club Card
   - Store location where they made the qualifying purchase

Department of Health FINI Team will work with Safeway to get a replacement coupon sent directly to the SNAP customer’s home address.

Spot Check

If you know a SNAP participant who plans to use or currently uses the program, you can ask them to report back after they make a qualifying purchase—did the coupon print out as expected?
ATTENTION ALL CASHIERS

Complete Eats Produce Promotions for Customers who use SNAP/EBT Food Benefits

Albertsons and Safeway are partnering with Washington State Department of Health on two programs designed to encourage customers who use SNAP (formerly called “food stamps”) to buy more fruits and vegetables. Details and procedures about the two programs are included below. Questions may be directed to your District Front End Op.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit and Vegetable Prescription Produce Vouchers</th>
<th>Complete Eats Catalina Coupons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DETAILS</strong></td>
<td><strong>DETAILS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– $10 vouchers distributed by local health clinics to patients</td>
<td>– Customers who spend a minimum of $10 on qualifying fruits and vegetables using their SNAP/EBT card along with their Safeway Club Card will receive a Catalina coupon for $5 off their next qualifying produce purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Vouchers are in English and Spanish</td>
<td>– Qualifying fruits and vegetables include fresh, canned and frozen with NO added fats, sugar and salt. All products that contain syrups, sauces, and seasonings are excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Patients can use vouchers like cash to buy qualifying fruits and vegetables at any WA Safeway</td>
<td><strong>PROCEDURES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Qualifying fruits and vegetables include fresh, canned and frozen with NO added fats, sugar and salt. All products that contain syrups, sauces, and seasonings are excluded.</td>
<td><strong>PROCEDURES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCEDURES</strong></td>
<td>– When you notice that a Complete Eats coupon prints out for a customer, get excited! For example, say “Don’t lose this one! You earned a $5 coupon on your next shopping trip since you bought $10 in fruits and vegetables today.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Accept these vouchers</td>
<td>– Do NOT give change for purchases less than $5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do NOT give change for purchases less than $10</td>
<td>– If a customer expected a coupon but one did not print out, direct them to customer service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– For purchases over $10, the customer pays the difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Name: Complete Eats (will last 2 years)

Offer Details:

- Only for customers who use SNAP/EBT (food stamps)
- Started June 20, 2017 and will last for 2 years
- Customers who buy $10 in “qualifying produce” using their SNAP/EBT and their Club Card receive a $5 OFF Catalina coupon
- “Qualifying produce” is all fresh produce, and canned/frozen produce with no added fat, sugar or salt

Procedures:

- If customer makes a qualifying purchase but the coupon does not print, send them to customer service.
- When redeeming $5 OFF coupon, customer must spend $5 or more.
Important Information about Fruit and Vegetable Prescriptions

Details:

- Safeway is partnering with the WA Dept. of Health on a Fruit and Vegetable Prescription program
- Local clinics are distributing $10 vouchers to patients
- $10 vouchers may be in other languages (e.g. Spanish)
- Customers can use vouchers to buy “qualifying produce”
- “Qualifying produce” is all fresh produce, and canned/frozen produce with no added fat, sugar or salt

Procedures:

- Accept these vouchers. Customers can use multiple vouchers, but this will require multiple transactions.
- Do NOT give change for purchases less than $10
- For purchases over $10, the customer pays the difference